

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 11, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR DENNY: As discussed with you and your staff, in response to your request I am happy to accept a position on the Budget Committee as its Vice-Chairman.

It is my understanding this requires me to temporarily resign, or go "on leave," from the Committee on Science, but that I will be able to retain my position and seniority on that committee for the future.

I am grateful for this opportunity and appreciate the confidence you have placed in me.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 12, 2003.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: With this letter, please accept my resignation from the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, effective immediately.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

JIM GIBBONS,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 5, 108th Congress, and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Select Committee on Homeland Security:

Mr. COX of California, Chairman;  
Ms. DUNN of Washington;  
Mr. YOUNG of Florida;  
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska;  
Mr. SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin;  
Mr. TAUZIN of Louisiana;  
Mr. DREIER of California;  
Mr. HUNTER of California;  
Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky;  
Mr. BOEHLERT of New York;  
Mr. SHAYS of Connecticut;  
Mr. SMITH of Texas;  
Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania;  
Mr. GOSS of Florida;  
Mr. CAMP of Michigan;  
Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida;  
Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia;

Mr. ISTOOK of Oklahoma;  
Mr. KING of New York;  
Mr. LINDER of Georgia;  
Mr. SHADEGG of Arizona;  
Mr. SOUDER of Indiana;  
Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas;  
Mr. GIBBONS of Nevada;  
Ms. GRANGER of Texas;  
Mr. SESSIONS of Texas;  
Mr. SWEENEY of New York;  
Mr. TURNER of Texas;  
Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi;  
Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California;  
Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts;  
Mr. DICKS of Washington;  
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts;  
Ms. HARMAN of California;  
Mr. CARDIN of Maryland;  
Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York;  
Mr. DEFazio of Oregon;  
Mrs. LOWEY of New York;  
Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey;  
Ms. NORTON of the District of Columbia;  
Ms. LOFGREN of California;  
Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri;  
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas;  
Mr. PASCRELL of New Jersey;  
Mrs. CHRISTENSEN of the Virgin Islands;  
Mr. ETHERIDGE of North Carolina;  
Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas;  
Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky;  
Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island; and  
Mr. MEEK of Florida.

□ 1600

#### DO-NOT-CALL IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. TAUZIN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the bill (H.R. 395) to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to collect fees for the implementation and enforcement of a "do-not-call" registry, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 395 is as follows:

H.R. 395

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Do-Not-Call Implementation Act".

##### SEC. 2. TELEMARKETING SALES RULE; DO-NOT-CALL REGISTRY FEES.

The Federal Trade Commission may promulgate regulations establishing fees sufficient to implement and enforce the provisions relating to the "do-not-call" registry of the Telemarketing Sales Rule (16 C.F.R. 310.4(b)(1)(iii)), promulgated under the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.). Such regulations shall be promulgated in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code. Fees may be collected pursuant to this section for fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and shall be deposited and credited as offsetting collections to the account, Federal Trade Commission—Salaries and Expenses, and shall remain available until expended. No amounts shall be collected as fees pursuant to this section for such fiscal years except to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Such amounts shall be available

for expenditure only to offset the costs of activities and services related to the implementation and enforcement of the Telemarketing Sales Rule, and other activities resulting from such implementation and enforcement.

##### SEC. 3. FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION DO-NOT-CALL REGULATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall issue a final rule pursuant to the rulemaking proceeding that it began on September 18, 2002, under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 227 et seq.). In issuing such rule, the Federal Communications Commission shall consult and coordinate with the Federal Trade Commission to maximize consistency with the rule promulgated by the Federal Trade Commission (16 C.F.R. 310.4(b)).

##### SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORT ON REGULATORY COORDINATION.—Within 45 days after the promulgation of a final rule by the Federal Communications Commission as required by section 3, the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission shall each transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the telemarketing rules promulgated by both the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission;

(2) any inconsistencies between the rules promulgated by each such Commission and the effect of any such inconsistencies on consumers, and persons paying for access to the registry; and

(3) proposals to remedy any such inconsistencies.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—For each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission shall each transmit an annual report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the effectiveness of the "do-not-call" registry as a national registry;

(2) the number of consumers who have placed their telephone numbers on the registry;

(3) the number of persons paying fees for access to the registry and the amount of such fees;

(4) an analysis of the progress of coordinating the operation and enforcement of the "do-not-call" registry with similar registries established and maintained by the various States;

(5) an analysis of the progress of coordinating the operation and enforcement of the "do-not-call" registry with the enforcement activities of the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 227 et seq.); and

(6) a review of the enforcement proceedings under the Telemarketing Sales Rule (16 C.F.R. 310), in the case of the Federal Trade Commission, and under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 227 et seq.), in the case of the Federal Communications Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, February 11, 2003, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 395.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAUZIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, whatever happened to the quiet evening at home? Most people have experienced it, that annoying ring on the phone just as dinner goes to the table. When one answers, it is not a call from a friend or family member or even from work, it is someone calling to sell something, a telemarketer.

Today we have before us of a bill that will allow hundreds of thousands of American citizens to enjoy the peace and quiet of their own home. H.R. 395, the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act, authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to establish a national do-not-call registry that will allow consumers to opt out of unwanted and harassing telemarketing calls. This landmark do-not-call list will provide consumers with one central contact to stop unwanted telemarketing calls. The new do-not-call list will be a free service to all American consumers, and those telemarketers who choose to ignore the do-not-call registry will face stiff penalties of up to \$11,000 for each violation.

In order to coordinate the do-not-call programs among all of the agencies with jurisdiction over telemarketing, H.R. 395 directs the Federal Communications Commission to complete its pending do-not-call rulemaking within 180 days. The bill further directs the FCC to consult and coordinate with the Federal Trade Commission to ensure that both regulations are as similar as possible. This coordination will not only prevent consumer confusion, but it will provide the telemarketing industry with coordinated rules upon which to function.

Lastly, H.R. 395 sets out reporting requirements for both the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission. Without the passage of H.R. 395, the FTC will be forced to wait until the year 2004 to implement its national do-not-call list.

I am hopeful the other body will act swiftly to pass H.R. 395 so all Americans can enjoy the benefits of the national do-not-call list sooner rather than later. In fact, if anyone holds this legislation up, we are prepared to give out their home phone number to all who want to give them a call.

Today Congress is answering the call from consumers for help in combating annoying and harassing telemarketing calls. Therefore, to empower the American consumer, I ask that Members

support H.R. 395, the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan legislation, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and, I am proud to say, my chairman as a new member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), chairman of the subcommittee; and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who strongly supports this legislation, for their outstanding leadership in advancing this proconsumer bill.

As a new member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and as ranking Democratic member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, I look forward to working with my colleagues to implement this important measure.

Madam Speaker, we all appreciate the precious time we have at home with our families after a long day of work, but who has not had that time interrupted by commercial telemarketers? We all know from personal experience how intrusive these calls can be. I hear complaints from many of my constituents who are tired of receiving telemarketing calls at home. They should be able to stop these calls, if they so choose, and the FTC's creation of a national list will make it easier for people to enjoy peace and quiet at home.

This proconsumer legislation authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to collect fees from telemarketers to create a national do-not-call registry. Consumers who do not wish to be solicited at home can put themselves on the registry. Telemarketers are required to check the database every 3 months and remove names that appear on the list from their call list.

In December, the FTC amended the Telemarketing Sales Rules to create a national do-not-call list. This legislation will help the FTC implement this important initiative. I am pleased that the FTC's proposal will protect the First Amendment rights of telemarketers. Telemarketers will be able to continue to solicit consumers who do not put themselves on the list. Telemarketers will still be allowed to call those who are on the do-not-call list when an existing business relationship exists. However, all solicitors who qualify for this exception have to honor requests from individuals if they ask not to be contacted in the future.

It is my understanding that the FTC hopes to have the list up and running within the next few months. And this legislation protects the ability of legitimate charities and not-for-profit organizations to make calls, and they are not regulated by this legislation. However, even if in those circumstances any person asks not to be

called again by that organization, that request must be honored.

So, again, I support this legislation. I urge all Members to vote in favor of its passage. I also want to urge appropriators to provide full funding for this program in the omnibus appropriations bill. I hope that they will consider incorporating the text of this legislation in the conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, and ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has outlined the reason for this bill, and obviously I support it. It is under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, and it authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to collect the needed fees to maintain such a national registry. It is a very important bill, and as such, I seek all of my colleagues' support this afternoon.

I commend the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission for taking the initiative on this issue, and its hard work in promulgating the recent amendments to the Telemarketing Sales Rule. Specifically, the do-not-call amendments. As a Member that has championed consumer information privacy legislation for the past 2 years in my subcommittee, and we have had six hearings on it, I think a national do-not-call list is important. Although small, it is a step towards further enhancing consumers' privacy.

There is no question that I, along with most of my constituents, welcome any effective measure designed to protect us from unwanted telephone solicitations. A national do-not-call list goes a long way in fulfilling our want for a little peace and quiet at the family dinner table. It is important that the national do-not-call list truly be a one-stop shopping experience for the consumer.

As directed by H.R. 395, the Federal Trade Commission must work to ensure harmonization among the myriad of States and Federal telemarketing rules and do-not-call lists. That is not an easy job. As it now stands, I understand that 28 States have their own do-not-call lists, and the Federal Communications Commission may be considering another.

I strongly encourage the FTC chairman, Chairman Muris, to work very closely with the FCC on its national do-not-call registry proposed rulemaking so that if the FCC was to promulgate its own rule, it is substantially harmonized and in agreement

with the Federal Trade Commission rule.

For American consumers to enjoy one-stop shopping when seeking to protect him- or herself from unwanted telephone solicitation, there ought to be a single national registry governed by one set of Federal rules. I think we need a single national list for all interstate calls so there is only one toll-free number or one Web site address and one government agency we, as consumers, need to remember and go to for assistance. Passage of H.R. 395 is an important step in making that possible.

In closing, I reiterate my strong support for an effective national do-not-call list. I think the Federal Trade Commission's do-not-call amendments to the Telemarketing Sales Rule creating a national registry is a giant step in the right direction and, as such, deserves our support. I urge Members to support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), a very eloquent member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), and all of the members of the majority and minority for coming together to work out a very important piece of legislation.

This is a bill which I think is long overdue and is going to be very well received in every single home across our country, because the legislation authorizes the Federal Trade Commission, after its recent decision, to create a national telemarketing do-not-call database. This do-not-call database proposal is a winner for millions of consumers who are plagued by unsolicited commercial telemarketing calls at home or on their mobile phones, and it is important that we give the Federal Trade Commission the support it needs to implement this new policy as soon as possible, and that is what we are doing today here on the House floor.

The bill the House considers today permits the Federal Trade Commission to proceed on a timely basis and begin implementation of the database process this year while also ensuring that the Federal Communications Commission finally gets its regulatory task done so that no major corporate telemarketing loopholes remain.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation. Every Member who has worked on this legislation deserves a lot of credit. After having first proposed a national do-not-call database registry in legislation that the Congress successfully enacted in 1991, I believe its implementation is action that is long overdue. Consumers across the country will finally be able to put an

effective "no soliciting" sign on their home phone or cell phone and bring to a halt the seemingly nightly ritual of phone calls interrupting dinner or precious family time. Those telephone rings invade the tranquility of the home and the do-not-call database will help consumers restore peace.

Rather than having consumers act as veritable slaves of those rings, forced to get up and to answer insistent and incessant telemarketing calls time after time, the do-not-call database will effectively make consumers the "Lord of the Rings." They can put an end to those calls. They can protect their own domain.

Consumers have waited a long time for the benefits of the same digital and telecommunications technology that has so advanced the ability of telemarketers to efficiently and cost-effectively reach consumers to also be harnessed on behalf of consumers to help them address legitimate privacy concerns.

□ 1615

I see the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) over there. There are Members on the left and right, Democrat and Republican, that want privacy in their own homes. This has no ideology. Every American believes they have that inherent right.

Finally, I want to commend Federal Trade Commission Chairman Timothy Muris for his pro-consumer action in promulgating the FTC's recent do-not-call rules, as they will give the consumers who are often plagued by unwanted, intrusive, unsolicited telemarketing a powerful new tool in which to battle such intrusions. Again my congratulations to everyone who worked on this important legislation.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I want to commend Subcommittee Chairman STEARNS, Ranking Member SCHAKOWSKY, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) of the full committee, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) of the full committee for bringing this bill to the floor. I am a cosponsor. I think there are improvements that could be done to the bill, but I think it is a good step in the right direction.

I have been in the Congress for 18 years. I have been on the Committee on Energy and Commerce for the last 16 of those 18 years. I was one of the Congressmen who led the fight in committee to make sure that caller ID could be used as an option for those that wished to know who was calling them. I also helped lead the fight in committee to make sure that if somebody was trying to call you and blocked their identity, you could block

their call, that block-the-blocker technology. This is another step in that protection of privacy that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) talked about, so that when you are in the privacy of your home, if you choose to not have any unsolicited phone calls coming into your home, you can sign up for this.

I have signed up for the do-not-call list in Texas. I have lived in the same house for the last 14 years. I have subscribed to the Dallas Morning News that entire time. And until recently I continued to get solicitation calls from the Dallas Morning News asking me to subscribe to the Dallas Morning News. Maybe with the do-not-call list in Texas and the do-not-call list at the national level, I will not get that call. Unfortunately, I will still get a phone call from Majority Leader TOM DELAY. I have raised substantial sums of money for the NRCC, but I do get solicitation calls asking me to help Majority Leader DELAY continue to raise necessary funds for various good political causes. That is one of the exceptions.

So there are things that we could do to improve the bill, but it is a good step in the right direction and I hope that we pass this bill on a bipartisan basis unanimously because it is a good piece of legislation.

Again I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for his excellent leadership and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for her leadership on this necessary piece of legislation.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), a great consumer advocate and member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WYNN. Madam Speaker, I am also delighted to join my colleagues in supporting the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act. Let me commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), our subcommittee chairman, as well as our newest and quite-generous-with-her-flattery new subcommittee ranking member, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), for her leadership on this bill.

As we debate great global and national issues, this may not seem to be such a big deal. On the other hand, if you have worked hard all day, fought through traffic to get home to be with your wife and family to sit down to a simple dinner and you get a phone call from someone from Acme advertising something that you really do not want, this is a very big deal. It is something that Congress can and, I am pleased to say, is taking care of. We are doing something about this, the annoyance of unwanted solicitations.

I get lots of complaints about it. I think it is a great idea that we are addressing this issue. As an elected official, I am not usually home at dinner-time; I am usually here in Washington or out in the district at some event. But when I go home, when I am home

on those rare occasions and I am trying to have dinner and I get a call, I get quite annoyed. So I know how folks feel. But it is also people who work at home who are trying to conduct their own business who are interrupted. It is also seniors who are at home and are maybe anxious or nervous or sitting alone. They get these repeatedly aggravating calls which they have to struggle to get up to answer only to find someone from Acme on the line.

This is a good piece of consumer legislation. Combined with what the States have already done in 27 States and what the FCC and FTC can do, we can have a blanket of protection around consumers from the annoyance of unwanted calls. I am really pleased to see Congress acting so swiftly. I thank Chairman TAUZIN as well as Ranking Member DINGELL for their leadership. I think it is a great piece of legislation, I am proud to support it, and I look forward to its rapid implementation.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, in my home State of Indiana, our own no-call registry has been met with great success. While in Indiana there are over 6 million people, a little over 1.2 million phone lines in Indiana have registered to stop these unwanted telephone solicitations. I want to thank Indiana Attorney General Steve Carter for not only his leadership but also his persistence to succeed in this endeavor on behalf of consumers.

I am very pleased that the Federal Government is now responding to the concerns of consumers with legislation that will work to restrict these unwanted callers. It is my understanding that Indiana's no-call registry is more stringent than the Federal guidelines that are presently being proposed. It is also my understanding that those agencies crafting the Federal no-call guidelines, the FTC and the FCC, have no intent to preempt State law. I would urge both agencies to abide by this understanding.

Last July, I wrote a letter to FTC Chairman Muris asking that any creation of a Federal do-not-call registry would clearly express that the Federal rule would in no way preempt State law. And last month the entire Indiana delegation sent a letter to FCC Chairman Powell making the very same request. So while the creation of a national do-not-call registry delivers to the consumer the assurance that they may once again answer the phone in peace, I do hope that those States that have created their own do-not-call registries for the benefit of consumers will not be negatively affected in this rule-making process.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. I would first like to commend the chairman from Louisiana and the ranking member from Michigan, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts, for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor. As we have heard, this bill will give the Federal Trade Commission the authority to collect fees from telemarketers, long overdue, to implement and run the national do-not-call list which was created by the amendment to the telemarketing sales rule effective December 18.

The FTC has got it right. Something has to be done to protect consumers from the many annoying calls telemarketers place at all hours of the day and night, 7 days a week. These calls are indeed an invasion of privacy, not to mention that many of these callers are unscrupulous and prey on older Americans.

The Federal Trade Commission's national do-not-call list is a one-stop shop for consumers who are fed up with annoying and often intrusive telemarketing calls. Consumers by registering their telephone number with the FTC's list will eliminate, we hope, about 80 percent of all telemarketing calls.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to thank the FTC for working closely with me to include provisions of my "Know Your Caller" legislation which makes it illegal for telemarketers to block their numbers on caller ID devices. Consumers pay a monthly fee to subscribe to the caller ID service because they want to protect their personal privacy and their pocketbooks; but until now they have had little recourse to protest intrusions on their privacy because most telemarketers intentionally block their identity from being transmitted to caller ID devices.

Madam Speaker, as a Member of Congress and, more importantly, as a consumer, I applaud the FTC's amendment to the telemarketing sales rule; and I applaud and thank the committee for sponsoring this bill.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), who is not only a distinguished member of our class to the House of Representatives but the only Member of Congress who is a rocket scientist.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I concur with the remarks of my colleague from New Jersey who just spoke. I rise in support of H.R. 395, the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act; and I would like to salute Chairman TAUZIN and Ranking Member DINGELL for introducing what my colleagues will tell you, and my constituents especially will tell you, is important legislation. I cannot count the number of e-mails, phone calls, and letters I receive from constituents, many of them irate, complaining about telemarketing. The residents of my district have pleaded with me to do something so that they

can have a peaceful family dinner, not interrupted by credit card solicitations or the latest condominium offerings on some tropical locale. I know what they are talking about, because frequently my dinner is interrupted by these calls, too. They have been described as nuisances, extremely annoying, and by stronger language.

We should not stop companies from developing and using innovative ways to sell their products and services, but there is little question that this kind of telemarketing is out of hand. It has become a form of harassment. Just as citizens have the right to tell door-to-door solicitors to leave their property, Americans should have the right to tell telemarketers to stop calling and to make it happen.

The Do-Not-Call Implementation Act will be widely appreciated. It does not prohibit telemarketing. It does not stop companies from using phone solicitation to sell legitimate products and services. It empowers individuals by creating a realistic and enforceable way for them to get their names off telemarketing lists.

We have had do-not-call lists on the books, legislation, for more than a decade. But when Congress first mandated such lists, the FCC chose to leave creation and maintenance up to individual businesses, making enforcement next to impossible. That is why the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act is a great step forward in creating a real nationwide do-not-call list.

Finally, Madam Speaker, people will be able to opt out of telemarketing by registering online or making a simple phone call. Telemarketers will face serious consequences for noncompliance. I think a fine of \$11,000, up to that amount, for each call will get their attention. It is about time that the Federal Government protect the citizens from this unwanted harassment. After we are successful in implementing this, I hope we will turn our attention to electronic mail spam.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act. We have do-not-call lists now in 21 States, but we seem to have the calls only increasing in frequency. The fact that these calls seem to occur at the most inopportune times and, thanks to predictive dialing software, often result in an immediate disconnection only adds to the frustration of consumers.

I am very pleased that the Federal Trade Commission is amending the telemarketing sales rules to create a central do-not-call registry. As a new member of the appropriations subcommittee that funds the Federal Trade Commission, I am committing my efforts to make sure that this effort is fully funded so that we can implement this needed legislation.

I want to commend Chairman TAUZIN, Ranking Member DINGELL, and

also subcommittee Ranking Member SCHAKOWSKY for her efforts on this. I think working together in a bipartisan way, we will ensure that the Federal Trade Commission not only has the underlying legislation but also the appropriations to make sure that every person's castle can be a quiet home and that we do not have to worry about the telemarketing barbarians at the gate every single evening.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who has stood up for the rights of consumers so many times on this floor.

□ 1630

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I congratulate her again for her membership on the Committee on Energy and Commerce and her very rightful position dealing with consumer advocacy.

This is a legislative initiative that I wanted to applaud and speak to because I live in a community that has a substantial number of senior citizens. I have had the occasion to be engaged with these senior citizens in town hall meetings when they have held up mail or they have said, I got a call and how should I respond; or maybe unfortunately some have already responded, and that is by sending money, by buying whatever the individual was trying to sell or be frightened for not being able to secure it.

This legislation is extremely important and balanced.

Certainly we realize that telemarketing is an industry, that people work in telemarketing, that many of my constituents, likewise in hourly wages, survive by being telemarketers. We want them to continue to be able to do their work. At the same time, I think it is important that as they do their work, they also respect those who may be intimidated by the process.

I am grateful that the legislation was thoughtful, that it seeks to balance by providing the FTC with the responsibility of imposing user fees on telemarketers, for establishing and maintaining a national do-not-call list. What is wrong with consumers having a choice, being able to be on the list? So therefore I would like to add my support to this legislation.

And before I go to my seat, I wanted to also make sure that I acknowledged the legislation previously on the floor regarding the POWs and to acknowledge the 30 years after Mr. SAM JOHNSON of my State found his way home and to simply say how appreciative we are of the service of our men and women, in particular those who were willing or understood that even though they were prisoners of war, they were never forgotten.

So I thank him for his service, and I add my support to H.R. 395 and to the proceeding legislation.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I look forward to all our colleagues supporting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Do Not Call Implementation Act, H.R. 395, which will authorize the Federal Trade Commission to establish a landmark national do-not-call registry that will allow consumers to opt-out of unwanted and harassing telemarketing calls. With passage of this bill, our families will be able to wind down their long days by eating a peaceful dinner without the incessant calling that so often annoys and disrupts our time with our families.

Electronic market capabilities and strategies have become more aggressive as technology has advanced and action needs to be taken to protect the peace and privacy of people in their homes. I feel that this legislation, which is similar to a Connecticut law, goes a long way in accomplishing that. The intention of telemarketers and others are by no means sinister, but Americans must have the means to protect themselves from different kinds of intrusions, including the frequent bothersome telemarketing calls interrupting a family dinner, which this legislation would enable them to do. As different kinds of technology continue to move forward, we must be vigilant in ensuring that the personal privacy rights of our citizens are not being encroached upon.

The larger issue of privacy in our nation does not end with this legislation, obviously, but rather this bill becomes one of several tools that Congress has been able to employ to protect our citizens. There are still other avenues of privacy that must continue to be safeguarded including wireless services, financial information as well as computers and communications. This legislation is certainly an important step in this direction.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of privacy protections for consumers nationwide as we consider the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act. My home state of Oregon is one of a growing number of states that have recognized the growing importance of protecting consumer privacy. Oregon's legislature has parlayed its respect for individual privacy into legislation regulating telemarketing calls. Like those in more than two dozen other states, Oregon's lawmakers have seen fit to compile a list of individuals who no longer wish to receive unsolicited telemarketing calls. And, they have vested the attorney general with the power to levy harsh sanctions on those firms who call listed consumers anyway. Oregon's law is powerful and effective because it allows for the local enforcement of telemarketing rules with narrow exceptions. Only political organizations and a few not-for-profit groups are exempt from the restrictions on calls placed to listed consumers.

It is important to me that Federal legislation authorizing the creation of a national "do not call" registry does not unnecessarily widen the carefully carved exceptions of state laws like Oregon's. States that have developed strong protections on privacy should not see their rules watered down. I sincerely hope and expect that FTC will show deference to determinations made by states as it coordinates the

national "do not call" registry with existing state lists. Consumers deserve the continued benefit of well-designed state laws. Though Oregon has a strong "do not call" system in place, I realize that many consumers live in places without state law protections. It is for these consumers that creation of a national "do not call" database is most vital. In Oregon, more than 125,000 people have added their names to the state managed "do not call" list. This is evidence of the widespread public appeal of being able to vastly reduce the number of sales calls to which one is subjected. Subsequently, I have no doubt that many Americans would consider a national "do not call" list a welcome weapon in fending off nightly invasions of their peace and privacy by telemarketers.

In short, a national "do not call" registry would extend to all Americans the benefits already realized by subscribers to similar lists in varying states. I've heard firsthand from Oregonians about the success of their "do not call" list. I would very much like the expanded opportunity for privacy of "do not call" lists to be available nationwide. In the twenty-first century, our names, addresses, phone numbers and spending habits have all become commodities for commercial trade. Our telephones often function as much as a marketing tool for salesmen as a tool for our convenience. As a rule, unwanted sales calls come at the most inopportune time, steal our time from our families and children, and reduce the quality of our lives. We should make sure that Americans have real tools for mitigating the damage that telemarketing calls can have. That is why I support a national "do not call" registry that respects strong state privacy protections. That's why I support the recognition of those state lists by the FTC. And that's why I support the rights of consumers to control telemarketer access to their phones.

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Madam Speaker, today members of the House will approve H.R. 395, the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act. This measure is designed to return privacy to consumers, but more must be done to close loopholes and fully protect consumers from unwanted telemarketing phone calls to their home.

My main interest in the implementation of a national Do Not Call registry is to ensure that such a list improves rather than diminishes the laws already in place in 27 states, including my State of Missouri. Missouri's Do Not Call list, which was implemented on July 1, 2001, gives consumers the ability to choose whether they would like to receive unsolicited telemarketers calls. 1,133,636 phone lines have registered with the Missouri Attorney General's office as of this February to avoid unsolicited phone calls, more than half of the households in the State. These results are representative of other states that have implemented a Do Not Call list.

More than 90 percent of the reported "violations" of the state law are not illegal, which confuses consumers. This is due to freedom of speech which enables political, charitable, and government regulated businesses to make unsolicited phone calls. Financial services companies and phone companies are not regulated by the Missouri Attorney General, thus these entities can legally solicit anyone in Missouri by phone. These loopholes, as well as others permitting "consultations" but not

sales, have allowed unsolicited calling to continue, even of those consumers who have registered on the state Do Not Call list. I urge the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to follow the spirit of H.R. 395 and restrict calls by regulated industries such as credit card companies and phone companies which account for a majority of the telemarketing calls. In addition, the FTC and FCC must work to transfer state Do Not Call lists to the federal list so that consumers who have signed up locally will not have to do so nationally. Even though not explicitly stated in the bill, a rule to provide this convenience will enhance the effectiveness of this effort.

FTC Chairman Timothy Muris told the Energy and Commerce Committee that the Federal Do Not Call list is to be funded by the telemarketers who must purchase an updated Federal Do Not Call list every three months, ensuring protection to consumers. The text of H.R. 395 does not explicitly state this, thus the measure leaves room for loopholes for specific telemarketers. I look forward to studying the required FTC & FCC reports to Congress ensuring that H.R. 395 successfully protects those who choose not to receive telemarketer calls. H.R. 395 should follow the original intent of state Do Not Call laws and use Federal jurisdiction to close loopholes that states cannot.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the House is taking action today on H.R. 395, the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act, to help establish a national do-not-call registry. I strongly support this important legislation that will greatly benefit consumers by providing them with a simpler, more effective and efficient way to notify telemarketers that they do not want to receive unsolicited phone calls.

According to the FTC, consumer complaints regarding unwanted telemarketing calls increased over one thousand percent between 1998 and 2002. Although telemarketers are currently already required to maintain do-not-call lists, the FTC's decision to create a national do-not-call registry is a critical step towards further decreasing the hundreds of annoying and unwanted telemarketing calls that consumers receive each year. The do-not-call registry would allow consumers to list their phone numbers to notify all telemarketers that they no longer want to receive unsolicited calls, rather than having to contact each telemarketer individually.

Among other provisions, H.R. 395 provides a five-year authorization for the FTC to collect offsetting fees from telemarketers to pay for a National "do-not-call" registry, which is estimated to cost \$16 million annually. It also requires important consultation and coordination between the FTC and FCC to maximize consistency of its rules. Both of these provisions, and passage of this bill, are important steps toward making a national do-not-call registry a reality.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, H.R. 395, the "Do-Not-Call Implementation Act," authorizes the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to collect fees to fund its national do-not-call registry. Unwanted sales calls have become a nuisance that many consider an invasion of privacy. A national do-not-call registry will allow consumers to limit these unwanted intrusions and once again answer their telephones without aggravation.

Consumers, charities, telemarketing companies, local governments and other interested parties, have voiced their complaints and communicated their concerns. In the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act, passed in 1994, we gave the FTC the discretion to create a national do-not-call program. Based on that authority, the FTC has considered a wide range of complicated issues and has produced a reasoned result. I urge the appropriations in the Omnibus Appropriations Conference to include full funding of this program now. In fact, I have no objection under these circumstances to inserting H.R. 395 itself into the Conference Report.

As the FTC launches the do-not-call registry, we must monitor its progress closely. By any measure, coordinating the efforts of the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission and state authorities into one national system will be a challenge. The rewards, however, can be great. As these many parts work together as one, we can achieve a comprehensive program that will empower consumers without unnecessarily burdening industry.

This is an important issue to consumers across the nation that should not be delayed any further.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 395, the Do-Not-Call Implementation Act of 2003. This legislation authorizes the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to collect fees from telemarketers for the implementation and enforcement of a national do-not-call registry. This legislation also requires that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) finalize its rules for such a list in coordination with the FTC to ensure there are no inconsistencies in the regulations.

Unfortunately, we have all experienced those annoying unsolicited phone calls as we sit down to enjoy dinner with our families. A national registry will help limit unwelcome phone calls and restore a sense of control over the telephone where it belongs, with the consumer. The FTC's decision to develop such a registry comes after nearly a year of analysis, in which more than 60,000 public comments were received, the overwhelming majority of which supported a national do-not-call list. A national list will provide consumers with a quick and efficient mechanism to remove their names from telemarketing lists. Consumers will be able to register for free online or by calling a toll-free number. This will be less burdensome than forcing consumers to make such requests on a company-by-company basis, and will work in concert with states such as Illinois that either have or are implementing such lists.

I have received numerous messages from my constituents in the 12th District of Illinois concerning their frustrations with telemarketers. A national do-not-call list will answer a long-felt consumer need for better control over telemarketing calls to the home. I urge my colleagues to support this pro-consumer legislation.

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, today, along with my colleagues, Mr. UPTON and Mrs. WILSON, as original co-sponsors, I re-introduce the "Telecommunications Development Fund Improvement Act."

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 included an important provision, which I co-sponsored with the former Subcommittee Chair, Mr. Fields, to expand the availability of

investment capital to small businesses in the telecommunications industry working to develop new technologies to improve telecommunications services to under-served urban and rural communities. The 1996 Act created the Telecommunications Development Fund ("TDF") and financed the Fund from interest collected on the initial deposits the FCC required of all bidders in the FCC's spectrum auctions.

Currently, in order to qualify to participate in FCC auctions of spectrum for telecommunications services, the FCC requires prospective bidders to deposit a specified dollar amount with the FCC. Under the legislation adopted in 1996, the FCC places these deposits—sometimes called "up-front payments"—in an interest-earning account. A "successful bidder" is identified through the auction process. The "deposits" of the unsuccessful bidders that had been held by the FCC are returned to these bidders without interest. The principal amount of the successful bidder's deposit is paid to the U.S. Treasury. The interest earned on the upfront payments of all the bidders is remitted to the TDF.

Prior to the 1996 Act, tens of millions of dollars of bidders' deposits had been held in non-interest bearing accounts. By requiring that these funds be held in interest-bearing accounts, Congress provided a mechanism to finance the important goals of the TDF without any budgetary impact, without requiring any appropriations and without imposing either new taxes or fees. To date, fifty million dollars has been collected—at no cost to the taxpayer or the regulated industry—from interest earned on spectrum bidder's deposits. But more could be done to make telecommunications products and services available to under-served communities—rural and inner city—of every kind.

Once the successful bidder has been identified through the auction, a formal licensing process gets underway. At that time, the successful bidder is required to increase the amount of the deposit held by the Federal Government to 20 percent of the amount of the successful bid. The remainder of the successful bid is payable when the license is issued. Typically, a number of months pass between when the successful bidder is identified and when the license is formally issued by the FCC. The interest that could be earned on the additional deposits—sometimes called "down payments"—during the licensing process represents a significant source of funding for the TDF.

Unfortunately, despite the language of the 1996 Act—which makes no distinction between bidders' "up-front payments" and successful bidders' "down payments," referring to both simply as "deposits,"—the FCC has not required increased "down payment" deposits of initially successful bidders to also be placed in interest bearing accounts for the benefit of the TDF. As a consequence, small telecommunications companies, and the people in under-served urban and rural areas that might have been the beneficiaries of the technology these companies are working to develop, have been deprived of access to tens of millions of dollars of additional investment capital that the TDF could have made available. This additional source of investment capital would have come from the interest that could have been earned on the additional down payment deposits during the period between the identification of the successful bidder and the issuance of the license.



The Telecommunications Development Fund Reform Act ("TDFIA") rectifies this drafting oversight to close the loophole created by the FCC. The TDFIA renames the bidders' initial deposits as "up-front payments" and preserves existing law treatment of the interest earned on these payments. The TDFIA also defines the additional deposits made by successful bidders as "down payments" and treats these down payments the same way as existing law treats the bidders' initial deposits/up-front payments, i.e., the down payment funds will be required to be placed in an interest-bearing escrow account and, upon issuance of the license, the interest earned will be required to be remitted to the TDF.

The amendments made by the TDFIA are purely prospective in effect, applying only to future FCC spectrum auctions. The amendments would have no effect on existing down payments held by the FCC in connection with previously conducted auctions. In particular, the TDFIA would have no effect on the controversy or pending litigation related to the so-called "NextWave" licenses, and would not affect any bidder's entitlement to a refund of deposited funds or any bidder's claim for payment of interest on any refund.

The FCC does not oppose these provisions of the TDFIA.

Finally, the 1996 Act requires the TDF to satisfy the requirements of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 ("FCRA"), 2 U.S.C. § 661 et seq., prior to making loans. Except for this reference, the FCRA applies only to loans made by Federal Government agencies.

One of the purposes of the FCRA was to "place the cost of [Federal] credit programs on a budgetary basis equivalent to other Federal spending." 2 U.S.C. § 661(2). Consistent with this purpose, among the provisions of the FCRA are requirements for "budgetary authority" in an appropriations act to cover the cost of new Federal loans or loan guarantees, 2 U.S.C. § 661c(b), and application of budgetary accounting requirements to loans subject to the FCRA, 2 U.S.C. § 661c(d). These requirements have no logical application to the TDF's funds, which are not subject to congressional appropriations or the Federal budget process. The Office of Management and Budget, to which administration and oversight of the FCRA is entrusted, concurs with this view.

Imposing the requirements of the FCRA on loans made by the TDF has erected an insurmountable barrier to the use of loans by the TDF as a financing option, notwithstanding the intent of the 1996 Act that the TDF be authorized to make loans to credit-worthy small businesses. By making TDF subject to FCRA, TDF would be required to obtain appropriations before it could make loans to prospective borrowers. Requiring the TDF to comply with the FCRA makes no sense from a policy standpoint (TDF receives no appropriated funds) and can only be explained as a drafting error.

The TDFIA repeals this requirement to enable the TDF to enjoy the same flexibility in making loans as any other non-governmental entity. The amendment to the TDF's loan authority made by the TDFIA preserves the requirement that the TDF comply with any other "applicable" Federal law in making loans to eligible small businesses. The amendment to the TDF's loan authority made by the TDFIA is narrowly focused and does not affect the existing substantive criteria of the 1996 Act

under which the TDF is authorized to make loans.

Madam Speaker, I hope that the Commerce Committee will schedule hearings on this important technical amendment to the 1996 Telecommunications Act and report the Bill to the full House for consideration early in this Session. I invite my colleagues to join me in passing this important legislation at a time when infusion of additional capital investment into struggling small telecommunications companies may help create jobs, stimulate new technology and expand telecommunications services to under-served urban and rural areas of the nation suffering from the current economic slowdown. This legislation can stimulate important economic activity without enactment of new taxes, appropriation of additional federal funds or any adverse effect on the federal budget deficit. I recommend it to my colleagues for their consideration and thank Mr. UPTON and Mrs. WILSON for their support of this worthy endeavor.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). All time having expired, pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, February 11, 2003, the bill is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

#### AMERICAN SPIRIT FRAUD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 346) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to increase civil penalties for violations involving certain proscribed acts or practices that exploit popular reaction to an emergency or major disaster declared by the President, and to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to seek civil penalties for such violations in actions brought under section 3 of that Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 346

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Spirit Fraud Prevention Act".

#### SEC. 2. INCREASE IN PENALTIES FOR UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES EXPLOITING REACTION TO CERTAIN EMERGENCIES AND MAJOR DISASTERS.

(a) VIOLATIONS OF PROHIBITION AGAINST UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—Section 5(m)(1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(m)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) In the case of a violation involving an unfair or deceptive act or practice in an emergency period or disaster period, the amount of the civil penalty under this paragraph shall be double the amount otherwise provided in this paragraph, if the act or practice exploits popular reaction to the national emergency, major disaster, or emergency that is the basis for such period.

"(E) In this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'emergency period' means the period that—

"(I) begins on the date the President declares a national emergency under the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); and

"(II) ends on the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the termination of the national emergency; and

"(ii) the term 'disaster period' means the 1-year period beginning on the date the President declares an emergency or major disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)."

(b) VIOLATIONS OF OTHER LAWS ENFORCED BY THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—Section 13 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 53) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e)(1) If a person, partnership, or corporation is found, in an action under subsection (b), to have committed a violation involving an unfair or deceptive act or practice in an emergency period or a disaster period, and if the act or practice exploits popular reaction to the national emergency, major disaster, or emergency that is the basis for such period, the court, after awarding equitable relief (if any) under any other authority of the court, shall hold the person, partnership, or corporation liable for a civil penalty of not more than \$22,000 for each such violation.

"(2) In this subsection—

"(A) the term 'emergency period' means the period that—

"(i) begins on the date the President declares a national emergency under the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); and

"(ii) ends on the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the termination of the national emergency; and

"(B) the term 'disaster period' means the 1-year period beginning on the date the President declares an emergency or major disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?